

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION EIGHT

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

RICHARD ANTHONY ADAMS,

Defendant and Appellant.

B208817

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. BA332447)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Los Angeles County Superior Court.

Barbara R. Johnson, Judge. Affirmed.

Rachel Lederman, under appointment by the Court of Appeal for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

On November 16, 2007, Noe Rojas was walking down the street when he was approached by Richard Adams on a bicycle. Adams demanded Rojas's iPod, cellular phone and wallet and Rojas gave him the items. After looking through his wallet, Adams threatened Rojas, telling him he knew where he lived if Rojas reported the crime. Adams then gave him back his wallet and cellular phone but kept the iPod.

On April 11, 2008, Adams pleaded no contest in count 1 to second degree robbery and in count 2 to dissuading a witness from reporting a crime. (Pen. Code, §§ 211, 136.1, subd. (b)(1).) Adams further admitted he suffered three prior strike convictions, two of which also qualified as prior serious felony convictions and as prior convictions for which he had served prison terms. (Pen. Code, §§ 667, subd. (a)(1), 667.5, subd. (b), 1170.12, subds. (a)-(d), & 667, subds. (b)-(i).) Adams was sentenced to an aggregate term of 16 years in state prison, consisting of the midterm of three years, doubled pursuant to the "Three Strikes" law, and 10 years for the two prior prison terms (five years each). The trial court also selected the midterm of two years for dissuading a witness, doubled for the prior strike allegation and ordered it to run concurrently with the robbery conviction. The prior prison term allegations were dismissed.

Adams appealed on June 6, 2008. We thereafter appointed counsel to represent him on appeal. On January 26, 2009, Adams's appointed counsel filed an opening brief which raised no issues. We notified Adams by letter that he could submit any ground of appeal, argument or contention which he wished us to consider within 30 days.

On February 24, 2009, Adams filed a two-page handwritten response, complaining that his trial counsel failed to file various motions he requested. "Specifically the motions [Adams] requested [his] lawyer to file were [*sic*] *Boykin-Tahl* (single case), [*sic*] *Sumstine*, and [*sic*] *Coffey*." We assume Adams refers to *Boykin v. Alabama* (1969) 395 U.S. 238, *In re Tahl* (1969) 1 Cal.3d 122, *People v. Sumstine* (1984) 36 Cal.3d 909, and *People v. Coffey* (1967) 67 Cal.2d 204, all of which involve challenges to prior convictions.

As far as we can tell, Adams appears to be making an ineffective assistance of counsel argument. He fails, however, to present an adequate record for direct appellate review of these claims. Indeed, the records of the prior conviction are not before us. If appellant wishes to further pursue these claims, he can do so by seeking habeas relief. (*People v. Ledesma* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 171, 217-218.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

BIGELOW, J.

We concur:

RUBIN, Acting P. J.

FLIER, J.